DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 620 JC 800 171

AUTHOR Grafton, Clive L.; Foy, Daniel D.
TITLE The "Second-Time Around" Community College Student: Assessment of Reverse Transfer Student Performance in a University Setting.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 7-11, 1980)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Academic Failure; *Attendance Patterns; College Role; *College Transfer Students; *Community Colleges; Educational Mobility; Grades (Scholastic); Postsecondary Education; Student Adjustment; Student Attrition; Student Motivation; Two Year Colleges; *Universities; Withdrawal (Education)
IDENTIFIERS *Reverse Transfer Students

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine the effectiveness of community colleges in aiding those students who transfer to a senior institution, fail academically, return to the community college, and then re-enter the senior institution. The study, involving an examination of student records and a survey, centered on three groups: (1) 137 community college students who had returned to their senior institutions after initial failure; (2) 75 reinstatee students who entered the senior institution as freshmen, dropped out with less than a 2.0 grade point average, and later returned; and (3) 57 other returnees who entered the senior institution as freshmen, left with less than a 2.0 average, attended an institution other than a community college, and later returned to the original senior institution. The study revealed that during their initial period of enrollment at the senior institution, community college transfers who failed to meet academic requirements left the university sooner than the other two groups. During their second period of enrollment at the community college, the transfers exhibited a high degree of motivation and earned higher grade point averages than the other groups. Upon return to the senior institution, community college transfers were more able to cope with academic pressures and achieved a higher degree of success than the other returnees. The study report includes 16 data tables. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED184620

THE "SECOND-TIME AROUND" COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENT: ASSESSMENT OF REVERSE TRANSFER STUDENT PERFORMANCE IN A UNIVERSITY SETTING

by

Clive L. Grafton
University of Southern California

and

Daniel D. Roy
University of California, Davis

A Paper Presented to The Annual Meeting
AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
Boston, Massachusetts April 7-11, 1980

JC 800 171

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Clive L. Grafton
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ABSTRACT

The "Second-Time Around" Community College Student: Assessment of Reverse Transfer Student Performance in a University Setting

CLIVE L. GRAFTON, University of Southern California

DANIEL D. ROY, University of California, Davis

An investigation was conducted to determine likelihood of academic success among reverse transfer students (sommunity college returnees). All students defined in that manner were compared to other transfer and native students through their records. 88 reverse transfer students were selected for detailed analysis. Results showed that community colleges are making a significant contribution in their salvage function. The community college appears to assist students in meeting the reentry challenge with maturity and seriousness of purpose. Rather than being scholastic pariahs, the reverse transfer student is a good risk for readmission.

The "salvage function" of the community college has been significantly redesigned since Medsker (1960) made reference to this aspect of the "open-door" college. As originally defined, the term was to describe high school students requiring remedial work before entering a senior institution. Plummer and Richardson (1964) extended this definition to include not only those high-risk students, but also students who had failed to achieve at a senior institution, utilizing the community college for reentrance preparation. Lee (1975) expanded the term further by including students who left senior institutions to go to community college, without reflecting academic difficulties, and who were redefining their academic goals. This broadened adaption became the community college's "retread function" (p. 9).

The community college student who attends a senior institution, academically fails, returns to a community college, then reenters a senior institution is the "reverse transfer" that was the subject of this investigation. Although selected aspects of the salvage function have been studied, the reverse transfer has been lightly touched upon in educational research. Meadows and Ingle (1968) posed the initial research question: "How well do reverse transfers perform when they return to the senior college or university?" (pp. 53-54). The importance of the investigation was predicated on (1) how well community colleges perform in this area of their salvage function, and (2) what implications are there for articulation relationships between the community college and senior institutions.

The reverse transfer student, or more specifically defined for this investigation, the second-time around student, has not been entirely overlooked. Studies have analyzed characteristics (Lee, 1975; Smith, 1973; Winstead, 1966); relationships of academic majors, attempted units, employment hours, sex, and age (Rose, 1975); goals and expectations (Lembke, 1969); self-concepts, attitudes, and expectations (Klemke, 1969); and performance of probationary students while on community college campuses (Brimm, 1971; Fischer, Kellerman, & Odom, 1975; Kuznik, 1971; Lee, 1975; Locks, 1965; Meadows & Ingle, 1968; Muck & Undem, 1965).

Additional follow up on returning reverse transfer students, those making their second appearance at a senior institution, have been urged by Meadows and Ingle (1968), Swaim (1972), and Lee (1975). Three studies have addressed the issue (Brimm, 1971; Carter, 1969; Swaim, 1972) all with some inherent limitations. Carter's data were drawn almost two decades ago. Brimm's research was dominated by a significant social factor--the draft. Swaim's study did not compare native students with the community college sample and stopped short of measuring persistence and achievement to the baccalaureate degree. The paucity of research in this area makes it extremely difficult to make generalizations on the second-chance student.

Method

The investigation centered on three groups: (1) community college students who had returned to the senior institution after initial academic failure; (2) reinstatee students who entered the senior institution as freshmen, dropped out with less than a 2.0 grade point average, and later returned; and (3) other returnees, students who entered the senior institution as freshmen, left with

less than a 2.0 grade point average, attended one or more terms at an institution other than a community college, later returning to the senior institution. These students involved those re-entering the senior institution between fall, 1968, through fall, 1977, attending the senior institution between the parameters of fall, 1968, through spring, 1978.

A total of 137 community college transfers, 75 reinstatees, and 57 other returnees were identified for inclusion. A control group was composed of 100 native senior institution students (those beginning as freshmen and persisting), and 80 senior institution transfers (those who transferred to the senior institution from a community college without attendance at any other type of institution).

Insert Table 1 about here

Two treatments were given. The first involved an examination of student records, which included reentry applications and transcripts. The second was a survey used to identify selected factors relating to community college student returnee academic success or lack of academic success. Of the 137 possible community college subjects, 88 were complete respondents. Eight could not be followed up because of insufficient addresses, while two were deceased.

Table 1

Subject Classification and Description for

Experimental and Control Groups

Experimental Group (N = 269)	Community college returnees (N=137)	Those returning to the senior institution after initial academic failure
	Reinstatees (N=75)	Those entering the senior institution as freshmen, leaving with less than a 2.0 average, and later returning to the senior institution
	Other returnees (N=57)	Those entering the senior institution as freshmen, leaving with less than a 2.0 average, attending one or more terms at an institution other than a community college, later returning to the senior institution
Control Group (N = 180)	Native students (N=100)	Those beginning as freshmen at the senior institution and persisting
	Community college transfers (N=80)	Those transferring to the senior institution from a community college without attendance at any other institution

Discussion

In the initial period of enrollment, community college transfers to the senior institution, who failed to meet academic requirements, left the university sooner than reinstatees and other returnees. The community college transfer students also established a significantly poorer academic record during this first enrollment period than either the control group or the reinstatees and other returnees. In the period between the first enrollment at the senior institution and return, community college transfers were absent significantly longer than the reinstatees and other returnees. Community college transfers attributed their failure during the first enrollment period to lack of motivation, intense competition for grades, lack of interest in studies, and too many social activities.

In the interim period (time of return to the community college), community college transfers exhibited a high degree of motivation and a maturing perception of their academic needs. Returnees to the community college found it easier to make grades, had determined new educational goals, found themselves in a more relaxed atmosphere, and expressed appreciation for smaller class sizes. Most students had sought initial guidance in the community college from faculty and parents. While at the community college during the interim period and then again when returning to the senior institution, reverse transfer students depended more heavily upon faculty and staff for direction. The frequency of guidance increased during each successive enrollment period. Community college transfers

had a greater percentage earning higher grade point averages than reinstatees and other returnees during the interim, or second, enrollment period.

Upon receiving a second chance to return to the senior institution, community college students made the most of their opportunities. Their success rate was higher than the reinstatees and other returnees, although not as high as the control group. Community college returnees also graduated at a higher rate than did other returnees. The return was not without problems as community college transfers perceived that making up prior academic deficiencies in the senior institution and readjusting to a more competitive environment created difficulties. Community college returnees identified their academic success as second-chance students to greater maturity, readiness to settle down and study, development of new educational goals, renewed interest in obtaining a degree, and interesting opportunities for taking upper-division courses.

Without question, evidence points to community colleges as providing a major avenue for accessibility through a second-chance salvage function. The community college transfer student, utilizing the community college as a vehicle of re-entry, fares slightly better than returning students who have no intervening campus experience. These returnees make good risks for readmission and are a source of senior institution enrollment that should not be overlooked. Senior institutions should analyze carefully policies that might be restrictive to this articulation opportunity, placing more interest in rescuing a mature learner who shows significant appreciation for the opportunity to have a "second-time around."

References

Brimm, J. L. Selected factors associated with academic performance of students who transfer from the University of Tennessee (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 4368A-4369A. (University Microfilms No. 72-5416, 122, 191)

Carter III, J. A. The role of Florida community junior colleges in rehabilitation of former Florida university students (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 30, 1030A-1031A. (University Microfilms No. 70-16, 322, 84)

Fischer, O. R., Jr., Kellerman, J. S., & Odom, J. W. Study of reverse transfer students at Seminole junior college and Valencia community college. Unpublished doctoral practicum, Nova University, Florida, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 108 717)

Klemke, L. W. Higher education academic failures coming to a community college and the labeling theoretical perspective (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 31, 1384A. (University Microfilms No. 70-15, 346, 225)

Kuznik, A. E. A study of the reverse transfer student: Policies regarding his transfer, factors influencing his decision to transfer, changes he made in his educational and vocational plans, and his success after transfer (Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 4955A. (University Microfilms No. 72-8274, 253, 201)

Lee, G. E. Reverse transfer: The retread function of community colleges. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., April 1, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 104 471)

Lembke, R. T. A comparison of perception of two-year college environment between native students and students who have attended a four-year institution prior to admission to a specific two-year college (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 30, 3731A. (University Microfilms No. 70-05, 305, 169)

Locks, C. S. Academic performance of students transferring to Los Angeles Valley College from two-year and four-year institutions. Unpublished report, Los Angeles Valley College, Van Nuys, California, 1965.

Meadows, M. E., & Ingle, R. R. Reverse articulation: A unique function of the junior college. College and University, 1968, 44, 47-54.

Medsker, L. L. The junior college: Progress and prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Muck, S. J., & Undem, J. Analysis of records of students entering El Camino College from other institutions. California: El Camino College, 1965. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 013 601)

Plummer, R. H., & Richardson Jr., R. C. Broadening the spectrum of higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 1964, 35, 308-312.

Rose, G. A. A follow-up study of the BCC reverse transfer student questionnaire. Unpublished doctoral practicum, Nova University, Florida, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 103 074)

Smith, M. G. The second chance transfer student. The Journal of Educational Research, 1973, 66, 307-308.

Stroud, P. M. The recovery function of the North Carolina community college system (Doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34, 2346A. (University Microfilms No. 73-26, 752, 102)

Swaim, J. B. A longitudinal study of the academic performance of reverse-transfer students at a selected junior college (Doctoral dissertation, Memphis State University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 5524A. (University Microfilms No. 73-10, 397, 106)

Winstead, W. M. Factors related to the academic careers of students who have transferred from senior colleges to two junior colleges in California (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1966). Dissertation Abstracts, 1967, 27, 3644A. (University Microfilms No. 67-04, 981, 310)

APPENDIX

Table 2

Number of Quarters Attended by Community College Returnees and Experimental Group During Their First Enrollment Period at the Senior Institution

	Quarters			
Group	Over 6	4-6	1-3	Total
Community College Returnees				
Number	5	52	79	136[a]
Percent	3.7	38.2	58.1	100.0
Reinstatees				
Number	18	24	33	75[b]
Percent	24.0	32.0	44.0	100.0
Other Returnees				
Number	11	18	27	56[cd]
Percent	19.7	32.1	48.2	100.0

Note: Chi-square values are between community college returnees and each other group.

[a]One returnee withdrew during the initial enrollment period.

[b]$X^2 = 20.623$ $p < .001$

[c]One returnee withdrew during the initial enrollment period.

[d]$X^2 = 12.191$ $p < .01$

Table 3

Mean Units Attempted Per Quarter by Community College Returnees and Experimental Group During Their First Enrollment Period at the Senior Institution

Groups	Units		
	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Community College Returnees	136[a]	11.68	2.69
Reinstatees	75	11.88	2.61[b]
Other Returnees	56[c]	11.35	2.47[d]

Note: *t* values are between community college returnees and each other group.

[a]One returnee withdrew during the initial enrollment period.

[b]*t* = .54 (NS)

[c]One returnee withdrew during the initial enrollment period.

[d]*t* = .78 (NS)

Table 4

Total Mean Quarter Units Attempted by Community College Returnees and Experimental Group During Their First Enrollment Period at the Senior Institution

	Quarters		
Group	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Community College Returnees	136[a]	41.48	22.00
Reinstatees	75	59.87	46.02
Other Returnees	56[b]	52.57	32.91

[a]One returnee withdrew during the initial enrollment period.

[b]One returnee withdrew during the initial enrollment period.

Table 5

Mean GPA by Number and Percentage of Community College Returnees and Experimental Group for the First Enrollment Period at the Senior Institution

Groups	Grade Point Average							
	1.75-1.99		1.50-1.74		Below 1.50		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Community College Returnees	71	52.2	30	22.1	35	25.7	136[a]	100.0
Reinstatees	51	68.0	12	16.0	12	16.0	75[b]	100.0
Other Returnees	39	69.7	5	8.9	12	21.4	56[cd]	100.0

Note: Chi-square values are betweeen community college returnees and each other group.

[a]One returnee withdrew during the initial enrollment period.

[b]$X^2 = 5.040$ (NS)

[c]One returnee withdrew during the initial enrollment period.

[d]$X^2 = 6.161$ $p < .05$

Table 6

Duration of Dropout Period in Months by Number and Percentage of Community College Returnees and Experimental Group

Groups	Months							
	27 and Over		15-26		Below 15		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Community College Returnees	61	44.5	59	43.1	17	12.4	137	100.0
Reinstatees	10	13.3	18	24.0	47	62.7	75[a]	100.0
Other Returnees	17	29.8	7	12.3	33	57.9	57[b]	100.0

Note: Chi-square values are between community college returnees and each other group.

[a] $X^2 = 59.492$ $p < .001$

[b] $X^2 = 45.781$ $p < .001$

Table 7

Mean GPA by Number and Percentage of Community College Returnees for Enrollment Period at Community College

	Community College Returnees	
GPA	Number	Percent
3.00 and above	56	47.5
2.50 - 2.99	36	30.5
2.00 - 2.49	24	20.4
1.50 - 1.99	1	.8
Below 1.50	1	.8
Total	118[a]	100.0

[a]Nineteen community college transcripts were not available from Registrar's Office.

Table 8

GPA Change of Community College Returnees from First Enrollment Period at Senior Institution to Community College Study Period by Number and Percentage

	Community College Returnees	
GPA Change	Number	Percent
2.00 and Above	16	13.6
1.00 - 1.99	60	50.8
Below 1.00	42	35.6
Total	118	100.0

Table 9

Mean Units Attempted Per Quarter by Community College Returnees, Experimental, and Control Groups During the Second Enrollment Period at the Senior Institution

Groups	Units		
	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Community College Returnees	132[a]	11.87	2.62
Reinstatees	74[b]	11.58	3.24[c]
Other Returnees	55[d]	11.38	2.66[e]
Senior Institution Transfers	100	12.40	1.96[f]
Senior Institution Natives	80	12.33	2.01[g]

Note: t values are between community college returnees and each other group.

[a]Four returnees withdrew during the second enrollment period.

[b]One reinstatee withdrew during the second enrollment period.

[c]t = .70 (NS)

[d]Two returnees withdrew during the second period.

[e]t = .16 (NS)

[f]t = 1.72 (NS)

[g]t = 1.36 (NS)

Table 10

Total Mean Quarter Units Attempted by Community College Returnees, Experimental Group, and Control Group During the Second Enrollment Period at the Senior Institution

Groups	Units		
	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Community College Returnees	132[a]	61.75	37.85
Reinstatees	74[b]	51.57	53.32
Other Returnees	55[c]	66.54	39.63
Senior Institution Transfers	90[d]	70.85	24.36
Senior Institution Natives	80[e]	64.64	25.99

[a]Four returnees withdrew during the second enrollment period.

[b]One reinstatee withdrew during the second enrollment period.

[c]Two returnees withdrew during the second enrollment period.

[d]Ten senior institution transfers (entering fall, 1977) had a minimum of one year of upper-division study during the second enrollment period.

[e]Ten senior institution natives (entering fall, 1975) had a minimum of one year of upper-division study during the second enrollment period.

Table 12

Length of Time in Months From First Entry to Graduation at the Senior Institution by Number and Percentage of Community College Returnees and Experimental Group

Groups	Months					
	72 and Above		Below 72		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Community College Returnees	30	53.6	26	46.4	56	100.0
Reinstatees	10	58.8	7	41.2	17[a]	100.0
Other Returnees	9	40.9	13	59.1	22[b]	100.0

Note: Chi-square values are between community college returnees and each other group.

[a] X^2 = .196 (NS)

[b] X^2 = 1.014 (NS)

Table 12

Distribution of GPAs by Number and Percentage of Community College Returnees, Experimental Group, and Control Group for the Second Enrollment Period at the Senior Institution

	Grade-point Average											
	3.00 and Above		2.50-2.99		2.00-2.49		1.50-1.99		Below 1.50		Total	
Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Community College Returnees	28	21.2	37	28.0	42	31.8	12	9.1	13	9.9	132[a]	100.0
Reinstatees	13	17.6	18	24.3	22	29.7	12	16.2	9	12.2	74[bc]	100.0
Other Returnees	9	16.4	15	27.3	16	29.1	8	14.5	7	12.7	55[de]	100.0
Senior Institution Transfers	46	46.0	34	34.0	13	13.0	4	4.0	3	3.0	100[f]	100.0
Senior Institution Natives	46	57.5	20	25.0	11	13.8	2	2.5	1	1.2	80[g]	100.0

Note: Chi-square values are between community college returnees and each other group.

[a] Four returnees withdrew during the second enrollment period.

[b] One reinstatee withdrew during the second enrollment period.

[c] $\chi^2 = 2.935$ (NS)

[d] Two returnees withdrew during the second enrollment period.

[e] $\chi^2 = 1.940$ (NS)

[f] $\chi^2 = 26.121$ $p < .001$

[g] $\chi^2 = 34.341$ $p < .001$

Table 13

GPA Change for Community College Returnees and Experimental Group From First to Second Enrollment Period by Numbers and Percentages

Groups	Grade-point Average: 1.00 and Above N	%	.50-.99 N	%	0-.49 N	%	Total N	%
Community College Returnees	55	41.7	34	25.7	43	32.6	132[a]	100.0
Reinstatees	21	28.4	23	31.1	30	40.5	74[bc]	100.0
Other Returnees	17	30.9	22	40.0	16	29.1	55[de]	100.0

Note: Chi-square values are between community college returnees and each other group.

[a]Four returnees withdrew during the second enrollment period.

[b]One reinstatee withdrew during the second enrollment period.

[c]$X^2 = 3.603$ (NS)

Table 14

Number and Percentage of Successful and Unsuccessful Community College Returnees, Experimental Group, and Control Group During the Second Enrollment Period at the Senior Institution

	Successful		Unsuccessful		Total	
Groups	N	%	N	%	N	%
Community College Returnees	89	65.0	48	35.0	137[a]	100.0
Reinstatees	41	54.7	34	45.3	75[b]	100.0
Other Returnees	36	63.2	21	36.8	57[c]	100.0
Senior Institution Transfers	91	91.0	9	9.0	100[d]	100.0
Senior Institution Natives	74	92.5	6	7.5	80[e]	100.0

Note: Chi-square values are between community college returnees and each other group.

[a] $X^2 = 2.165$ (NS)

[b] $X^2 = .058$ (NS)

[c] $X^2 = 21.451$ $p < .001$

[d] $X^2 = 20.494$ $p < .001$

Table 15

Status by Number and Percentage of Successful Community College Returnees, Experimental Group, and Control Group at Time of Final Termination at the Senior Institution or at the Conclusion of the Period Under Investigation

Groups	Graduated		Left in Good Standing		Still Enrolled Good Standing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Community College Returnees	56	40.9	20	14.6	13	9.5
Reinstatees	17	22.7	20	26.7	4	5.3
Other Returnees	22	38.6	6	10.5	8	14.0
Senior Institution Transfers	66	66.0	8	8.0	17	17.0
Senior Institution Natives	46	57.5	14	17.5	14	17.5

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
EE 36

APR 2 5 1980

Table 16

Status by Number and Percentage of Unsuccessful Community College Returnees, Experimental Group, and Control Group at Time of Final Termination at the Senior Institution or at the Conclusion of the Period Under Investigation

Groups	Left on Probation		Left on Disqual.		Left on Dismissal		Still Enrolled on Probation		Still Enrolled Subject to Disqual.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Community College Returnees	16	11.7	7	5.1	20	14.6	1	.7	4	2.9	137	100.0
Reinstatees	8	10.7	13	17.3	11	14.7	2	2.6	0	0.0	75	100.0
Other Returnees	3	5.3	5	8.8	12	21.1	1	1.7	0	0.0	57	100.0
Senior Institution Transfers	2	2.0	5	5.0	1	1.0	1	1.0	0	0.0	100	100.0
Senior Institution Natives	2	2.5	1	1.3	3	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	80	100.0